RESPONSE

This is a preliminary amendment and response filed with a Request for Continued Examination. The response is a response to the Final Office Action dated October 19, 2006. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner had rejected claims 49, 67, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 49-50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66-72, 77-83, 85, 88, and 90-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,075 ("Mason"). Claims 52, 53, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,382 ("Sparks"). Claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Official Notice. The rejections from the Final Office Action of October 19, 2006 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 49, 67, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner has rejected claims 49, 67, and 92 for lack of support in the specification because of the added limitation "the advertisement campaign including a plurality of advertisements." In particular, the Examiner stated that amendment leads to lack of support in the specification for the prior claim limitation of "when the advertisement is deemed not approved, the advertisement campaign is rejected." Claims 49, 67 and 92 have been amended with this response.

Applicants believe there is support in the specification for the claims as amended with this response. In particular, the specification states that in Figure 3B, "the advertiser selects which *ads* will run in [the] campaign" (emphasis added). As shown in Figure 3B, under "Step 2. Create Ad," the instructions state "[y]ou may include up to five ads per campaign." Figure 3B. In addition, Figures 3C, 4A, 4C, 6A, and 6B-1 further state or show that a campaign may include multiples ads. The Applicants have amended claims 49, 67 and 92 to state that "when the advertisement is deemed not approved, the advertisement ~~campaign~~ is rejected." There is support for this claim language in paragraphs 53-54 and Figures 6D and 6E. In particular, Figure

6E shows an ad that was approved by the review and an ad that was not approved (declined) after review.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 49-50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66-72, 77-83, 85, 88, and 90-93 as being "anticipated" by Mason. Applicants note that the Examiner has stated that Mason anticipates the claims, however, Applicants believe that the Examiner intended to state that the claims are obvious in view of Mason because the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Mason discloses methods "for obtaining Internet-type advertisements to fit designated advertising spaces allotted by a plurality of different and unrelated online newspaper websites, and automatically placing those advertisements." Mason, Abstract.

Mason fails to disclose or render obvious all of the claim elements of independent claims 49, 67 and 92 as amended. In particular, Mason fails to disclose "providing a self-service interface configured to allow for adjusting the maximum amount to spend, changing the status of the advertisement campaign, and modifying which of the plurality of advertisements is the advertisement designated by the received request" as in amended claims 49, 67 and 92. Mason does disclose "automatically tracking, auditing, comparing and changing online advertisements midstream, i.e., during the middle of an ad placement." Mason, Col. 4, ll. 54-57. In addition, Mason discloses the "purchase of advertising space on an online newspaper website for a particular length of time, by the number of hits the ad receives or by the number of click-throughs." Mason, Col. 5, ll. 6-9. There is no disclosure of adjusting the maximum amount to spend as in the claims. Further, there is no disclosure of changing the status of the advertisement campaign or modifying which of the plurality of advertisements is the advertisement designated by the received request as in independent claims 49, 67 and 92, as amended.

For the reasons described above, Applicants submit that independent claims 49, 67 and 92, as amended, are allowable. Likewise, claims dependent from allowable claims 49, 67 and 92 are also allowable. Specifically, dependent claims 50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66, 68-72, 77-83, 85, 88, 90, 91, and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious in view of Mason. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that dependent claims 50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66, 68-72, 77-83, 85, 88, 90, 91, and 93 are allowable.

Claims 52, 53, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Sparks. Sparks relates to the design and production of print advertising and commercial display materials over the Internet. Sparks, Abstract. Sparks fails to disclose the rejection of an advertisement campaign and the request with a maximum amount as in independent claims 49 and 67. Therefore, dependent claims 53, 75 and 76 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Official Notice. The Official Notice relates to the display of advertisements on a wireless devices, the advertisement placement, advertisement costs per click, advertisement costs per impression, etc. There is not Official Notice of the rejection of an advertisement campaign and the request with a maximum amount as in independent claims 49, 67 and 92. Therefore, dependent claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

III. CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections from the Office Action dated October 19, 2006 have been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

December 21, 2006
Date

Scott A. Timmerman
Registration No. 55,678

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200